

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 322-5330



September 13, 1982

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE I-126-82

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: AFDC QC ERROR RATES

REFERENCE:

This letter is to provide you the latest AFDC-FG/U Quality Control (QC) error rate findings.

Statewide

The final statewide AFDC error rate for the October 1980 - March 1981 review period is 8.6 percent. This is the highest California's AFDC error rate has been since 1974. Although the final error rate for the next period, April - September 1981, has not been officially released by the Federal government, State staff have estimated that it will be approximately 5.0 percent. While this represents substantial improvement from the prior period, it is still well above the established 4.0 percent performance standard.

As you may know, the October 1980 - March 1981 and the April - September 1981 review periods make up the first annual assessment period for federal fiscal sanctions pursuant to the Michel Amendment. Final error rates will be combined to create an annual error rate. California will be subject to a federal sanction of approximately \$12 million for each percentage point the annual error rate is above 4.0 percent.

County Specific

Attached are individual error rates for each of the 35 largest counties for the October 1980 - March 1981 and the April - September 1981 review periods. The regressed county error rates best correlate to the Federally-derived statewide error rate of 8.6 percent. Like the statewide error rate, they are based on an initial review of a sample of cases (original findings), followed by a rereview by the next level of government of a portion of the original sample. The two sets of findings are statistically combined to create regressed error rates.

As you will note, there are many counties with error rates above the performance standards established by the Legislature, 4.0 percent for October 1980 - March 1981 and 3.75 percent for April - September 1981. This level of performance is cause for concern. It should be absolutely clear to all of us that these statewide and county error rates represent the misexpenditure of an unacceptably large amount of money. For 1982-83, each one percent of error will cost over \$30 million statewide.

We must improve our performance in the delivery of AFDC benefits. In order to best ensure that this is achieved, we have:

1. Convened the AFDC Statewide Corrective Action Advisory Committee, a forum for counties to provide input on statewide error rate problems and corrective action (minutes of the first meeting are attached);
2. Begun the process of intensifying our corrective action efforts in those counties contributing to California's error rate increase.

I expect each county to evaluate its performance for these and subsequent periods, and take a fresh look at whether its corrective action efforts are appropriate. We will provide whatever support we possibly can to assist you in this important endeavor.

In order for us to once again achieve the exemplary level of performance for which we are historically known, it is necessary that we make a special effort, both individually and collectively, to identify the causes of errors and develop solutions.

Sincerely,



MARION J. WOODS  
Director

Attachments

cc: CWDA

AFDC PROGRAM  
Quality Control Payment Error Rates

October 1980 - March 1981

April - September 1981

County	Original County Finding	Regressed Error Rate	Original County Finding	Regressed Error Rate
Alameda . . . .	6.66%	6.66%	8.95%	8.95%
Butte . . . . .	0.90	0.81	5.81	5.81
Contra Costa .	7.57	6.08	4.16	4.16
Fresno . . . . .	2.73	2.20	5.32	5.32
Humboldt . . . .	7.04	7.04	2.90	2.90
Imperial . . . .	5.18	5.18	6.58	6.58
Kern . . . . .	0.75	0.38	1.81	0.00**
Kings . . . . .	5.10	0.00**	1.10	1.10
Los Angeles . .	3.28	9.56*	3.72	5.49
Madera . . . . .	2.31	2.31	3.06	3.06
Marin . . . . .	7.02	7.02	2.12	0.39
Mendocino . . . .	0.00	0.00	1.90	0.00**
Merced . . . . .	1.20	1.20	5.59	4.91
Monterey . . . .	9.57	9.57	6.71	8.04
Orange . . . . .	5.12	0.00**	4.72	4.72
Placer . . . . .	8.76	6.37	6.85	1.91
Riverside . . . .	8.29	13.40	5.11	5.11
Sacramento . . .	4.09	4.09	2.38	2.38
San Bernardino	6.55	6.55	4.89	4.89
San Diego . . . .	5.40	5.40	8.98	8.98
San Francisco . .	9.92	6.05	8.08	10.05
San Joaquin . . .	3.71	3.71	4.27	4.27
San Luis Obispo	2.42	1.57	2.80	2.80
San Mateo . . . .	4.16	4.16	2.40	2.40
Santa Barbara . .	5.70	4.67	8.50	8.50
Santa Clara . . .	7.16	7.16	9.37	9.37
Santa Cruz . . . .	3.04	5.41	4.21	0.00**
Shasta . . . . .	1.79	1.28	7.15	8.15
Solano . . . . .	5.26	4.53	5.62	5.62
Sonoma . . . . .	3.77	5.55	4.60	2.67
Stanislaus . . . .	6.91	6.91	5.43	5.43
Tulare . . . . .	2.75	1.29	2.18	2.24
Ventura . . . . .	4.38	8.33	3.08	3.19
Yolo . . . . .	5.59	5.59	4.73	4.73
Yuba . . . . .	3.33	0.00**	0.14	0.00**

\*Based on original state review and federal rereview.

\*\*The regressed error rate is set at zero whenever the State rereview finds no errors in the subsample. In these instances, the original county finding is the better indicator of county performance.

# STATEWIDE CORRECTIVE ACTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING SUMMARY

June 18, 1982

### Committee members present:

Marty Woods, Los Angeles County  
Librado Perez, Alameda County  
Sandra Terrell, Nevada County  
Ron Merrill, El Dorado County  
Bill Cole (for Dennis Hart), Sacramento County  
Kyle S. McKinsey, Department of Social Services

### Committee members absent:

Eugene R. Medlin, Stanislaus County  
Dennis Denny, Mendocino County

### State Representatives:

Joe Kelly, Review and Evaluation Division  
Harold Giles, Review and Evaluation Division  
Scott Gregerson, Review and Evaluation Division  
Phil Manriquez, Local Government Liaison  
Steve Larsen, Welfare Program Operations Division  
Charlie Marvin, Welfare Program Operations Division  
Dave Mullins, Welfare Program Operations Division  
Rich Kirkland, Welfare Program Operations Division

### Federal Representatives:

Jack Harris, Assistant Regional Commissioner  
Ken Chin, Family Assistance Program Specialist

The first meeting of the Statewide Corrective Action Advisory Committee (SCAAC) was held in Sacramento on June 18, 1982. The meeting opened with a discussion of the committee's role. It was agreed that the committee would deal with corrective action issues at the policy and conceptual level while serving in an advisory role to the State. Federal staff from the Office of Family Assistance will attend and contribute technical assistance. Working sub-groups and technical staff will be involved as necessary.

The link between the committee and the remaining counties will be through the county representatives reporting to the CWDA Board of Directors and appropriate CWDA sub-committees. The county representatives of the SCAAC will also provide copies of SCAAC meeting summaries to the general membership of CWDA.

It was agreed that each SCAAC member would serve for a term of at least eighteen months.

Responsibility for mailing out the agenda and preparing and distributing meeting summaries to the committee members will rest with the State AFDC Program Systems Bureau. Summaries will be prepared and released within one week of the committee meetings.

The SCAAC meetings will be held quarterly in Room 1741, 744 P Street, Sacramento from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on the following dates:

September 17, 1982	March 18, 1983	September 23, 1983
December 17, 1982	June 17, 1983	December 16, 1983

Next, Rich Kirkland of the AFDC Program Systems Bureau presented information on statewide error rates and corrective actions either planned or underway in the Department.

Joanne Hoffmann, Chief of the Food Stamp Program Management Branch described a project designed to result in improved Food Stamp Program policy interpretation to the counties. New, revised and reissued policy interpretations will be distributed to all counties along with an updatable computer listing of all policy interpretations referenced to the appropriate manual section.

The afternoon focused on developing specific action items. Listed below are the action items, time frames and responsibilities.

- Clearinghouse Function

Both the county and State representatives are to develop suggested approaches for facilitating sharing among counties of successful techniques, approaches, ideas, systems, procedures, and training materials for corrective action. Reports on this item are to be ready for the next SCAAC meeting.

- AFDC Quality Control Management Information System

The State AFDC Program Systems Bureau will provide copies of proposed refinements in this system to the county representatives of the SCAAC by July 15. Comments will be due back no later than the next SCAAC meeting.

- Stuffer Notices

State AFDC Program Systems Bureau will request copies of stuffers currently in use by counties. A catalog of stuffers and a suggested annual plan for their use will be prepared for discussion at the next SCAAC meeting.

- Employment Development Department (EDD) Interface With Counties

The State AFDC Program Management Branch will report at the next SCAAC meeting on the agreements reached with EDD for State level coordination and cooperation in the Employment Programs area and the level of support counties can expect from the local EDD offices. If appropriate, a representative from EDD will be at the meeting.

- Social Security Numbers

The State AFDC Program Systems Bureau will contact Los Angeles County by July 1 to further define the problems with the social security number verification project. Region IX of the Department of Health and Human Services will then be advised of any assistance needed from them. A report will be made to the SCAAC at the next meeting.

- Federal Funding for Demonstration Projects

The county representatives will poll the counties for suggested corrective actions with an error reduction focus which may be funded as Federal demonstration projects. This will be reported at the next SCAAC meeting.

The next meeting will be held on September 17, 1982.

If there are any corrections, additions, or deletions to this summary, please call Dave Mullins, Chief, AFDC Program Systems Bureau at (916) 322-5330.